UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,437	08/27/2003	Ronald Paul Wright	030134 (BLL-0103)	7250

7590 09/30/2005

Philmore H. Colburn II
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002

EXAMINER	
RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/650,437	WRIGHT, RONALD PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Melur Ramakrishnaiah	2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8-27-2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 7-8, 10-11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Brouwer et al. (US2004/0057425A1, Provisional application No. 60/413,386, filed Sep. 25, 2002, hereinafter Brouwer).

Regarding claim 1, Brouwer discloses a method of providing a regional E911 network, the method comprising: assigning public safety answering points (PSAPs) to ports located in a telephone network (fig. 1), wherein each of the port is associated with a calling party number (CPN) and a geographic location, identifying an incoming emergency call from an IP device (for example, 36/38, fig. 1), the IP device corresponding to a unique machine access code address and the incoming emergency call including CPN, determining which the port is an entry port associated with the IP device, wherein input to the determining includes the unique machine access code address and the incoming CPN, connecting the emergency call to one of the PSAPs (16 ... 18; 30 ... 32, fig. 1) corresponding to the entry port, and transmitting the CPN and the geographic location data to one of PSAPs corresponding to the entry port (figs. 1-3, paragraphs: 0002, 005 –0018).

Regarding claim 15, Brouwer discloses a system for providing a regional E911 network, the system comprising: one or more PSAPs (16 ... 18; 30 ... 32, fig. 1), a switch (20/42, fig. 1), an ISCP including a regional database (46, fig. 1) a router (not shown) including one or ports and in communication with switch, an IP device (for example 22/24, fig. 1) in communication with one of the ports in the router, a network location server (reads on 23) including a local ALI database (26, fig. 1), the NLS in communication with the PSAP, the ISCP and switch, wherein NLS includes instructions to implement a method comprising: identifying incoming emergency call from the IP device (for example 38, fig. 1), the IP device corresponding to to a unique machine access code address and the incoming emergency call including incoming CPN, determining which the port is an entry associated with the IP device, where input to the determining includes the unique machine access code address and the incoming CPN, connecting incoming emergency call to the one of the PSAPs (16 ... 18; 30 ... 32, fig. 1) corresponding to the entry port, and transmitting the CPN and the geographic location data to one of the PSAPs corresponding to the entry port (figs. 1-3, paragraphs: 0002, 005 –0018).

Regarding claim 25, Brouwer discloses a computer program product for providing a regional E911 network, the computer program product comprising: a storage medium readable by a processing circuit and storing instructions for executing by the processing circuit for facilitating a method comprising: assigning public safety answering points (PSAPs, fig. 1) to ports located in a telephone network, wherein each port is associated with a calling party number (CPN) and a geographic location, identifying an incoming

emergency call from an IP device (like 38, fig. 1) , the IP device corresponding to a unique machine access code address and the incoming emergency call including an incoming CPN, determining which the port is an entry port with the IP device, wherein input to determining includes the unique machine access code address and the incoming CPN, connecting the incoming emergency call to one of the PSAPs corresponding to the entry port, and transmitting the CPN and the geographic location data to one of the PSAPs corresponding to the entry port (figs. 1-3, paragraphs: 0002, 005 –0018).

Regarding claims 7-8, 10-11, 17, 19, 21, Brouwer further teaches the following: incoming emergency call is from an advanced featured customer, incoming call is from an E911 service handling customer (paragraph: 0006), geographic location data is an emergency location identification number, geographic data is geodetic (paragraph: 0017), NLS switch, a gateway server (reads on 23, fig. 1) network file server (reads on 44, fig. 1) and a call management server (44, fig. 1), switch is a class 5 switch, IP device (22/36, fig. 1) is a wired telephone.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouwer in view of Clise et al. (US PAT: 6.064,722, hereinafter Clise).

Brouwer differs from claims 2 and 16 in that although he teaches searching a local location information database (ALI) database corresponding to incoming CPN and to the machine access code address as shown in fig. 2; he does not teach the following: searching for this in a regional ALI database if it is not in a local ALI database.

However, Clise discloses data request router for use with emergency public safety answering point systems which teaches the following: obtaining information from an alternate information source if primary database is unable provide required information to PSAP (fig. 1, col. 5 lines 26-36).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Brouwer's system to provide for the following: searching for this in a regional ALI database if it is not in a local ALI database as this arrangement would facilitate PSAP to obtain information from alternate data sources to handle emergency call as taught by Clise.

5. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouwer in view of Clise as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Aprile (US PAT: 6,363,138).

Regarding claims 3-6, the combination does not explicitly teach the following: Local ALI/regional database is updated in response to the IP device being connected/disconnected to/from one of the ports.

However, Aprile discloses E-911/ALI information manager and management system which teaches the following: updating the ALI database in response to information changes (see abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Brouwer's system to provide for the following: Local ALI/regional database is updated in response to the IP device being connected/disconnected to/from one of the ports as this arrangement would facilitate to keep track of transactions happening in order to correctly process 911 calls as taught by Aprile.

6. Claims 9, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouwer in view of Horton et al. (US PAT: 6,041,222, hereinafter Horton).

Regarding claims 9, 12, the combination does not teach the following: emergency call is from a wireless device, gedetic data includes GPS data.

However, Horton teaches the following: emergency call is from a wireless device, gedetic data includes GPS data (col. 4 lines 43-54).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Brouwer's system to provide for the following: emergency call is from a wireless device, gedetic data includes GPS data as this arrangement would facilitate making emergency calls from an automobile which is involved in an accident as taught by Horton, thus facilitating the user to summon help in the event of an emergency.

7. Claims 20, 22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouwer in view of Zellner et al. (US PAT: 6,807,564, hereinafter Zellner).

Regarding claims 20 and 22, Brouwer does not teach the following: IP device is a wireless telephone/cellular telephone.

However, Zellner teaches the following: IP device is a wireless telephone/cellular telephone (col. 6 lines 4-8).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Brouwer's system to provide for the following: IP device is a wireless telephone/cellular telephone as this arrangement would facilitate to provide for other well-known devices for emergency use as taught by Zellner.

8. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouwer in view of Salvucci et al. (US PAT: 6,775,356, hereinafter Salvucci).

Regarding claims 13-14, Brouwer does not teach the following: geodectic data includes location code including a country field, a state field, a mile field etc, where the country field is three digits, the state field is three digits, etc.

However, Salvucci discloses real-time incident and response information messaging which teaches the following: ALI database which includes Emergency Service Number (ESN) which is a three digit code that can represent a geopolitical jurisdiction (col. 4 lines 27-39).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Brouwer's system to provide for the following: geodectic data includes location code including a country field, a state field, a mile field etc, where the country field is three digits, the state field is three digits, etc. as this arrangement would facilitate representing various emergency location related information by using codes to represent various information as taught by Salvucci which results in compact storing of information as is well known in the art.

9. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouwer in view of Cruickshank (US PAT: 6,704,294, filed 10-13-1999).

Regarding claim 18, Brouwer does not teach the following: firewall in communication with a router and the switch.

However, Cruickshank teaches the following: firewall in communication with a router and the switch (fig. 5 col. 5 lines 60-66).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Brouwer's system to provide for the following: firewall in communication with a router and the switch as this arrangement would provide required arrangement to filter the data addressed to computing devices to protect them from hostile sources as is well known in the art.

10. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brouwer in Contractor et al. (US PAT: 6,427,001 B1, hereinafter Contractor).

Regarding claims 23-24, the Brouwer does not teach the following: switch uses SS7 signaling, connecting the incoming emergency call to one of the PSAPs is performed using SS7.

However, Contractor discloses system and method for notification of 911 telephone calls using link monitoring system which teaches the following: switch uses SS7 signaling, connecting the incoming emergency call to one of the PSAPs is performed using SS7 (fig. 1, col. 5 lines 4-20).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Brouwer's system to provide for the following: switch

uses SS7 signaling, connecting the incoming emergency call to one of the PSAPs is performed using SS7 as this arrangement would provide means for verifying that resources are available for completing the call by using well known scheme of SS7 signaling before actual switch resources are committed for completing the call, thus contributing to the efficiency of call handling.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643